



# County of Los Angeles CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE

Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration  
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, California 90012  
(213) 974-1101  
<http://ceo.lacounty.gov>

WILLIAM T FUJIOKA  
Chief Executive Officer

Board of Supervisors  
GLORIA MOLINA  
First District

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS  
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY  
Third District

DON KNABE  
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH  
Fifth District

June 30, 2010

To: Supervisor Gloria Molina, Chair  
Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas  
Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky  
Supervisor Don Knabe  
Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

From: William T Fujioka  
Chief Executive Officer

## **SACRAMENTO UPDATE**

This memorandum contains an update on three County-sponsored measures related to: 1) licensure exemptions for health care practitioners; 2) enhancement of the County's existing homeowner notification program; and 3) reimbursement for special elections; and a status report on four County-advocacy measures.

### **Status of County-Sponsored Legislation**

**County-sponsored AB 2699 (Bass)**, which as amended on June 28, 2010, would exempt from California licensure specified health care practitioners from another state, who are in California for a short time to provide volunteer health, dental, and vision services to the uninsured or underinsured. The June 28, 2010 amendment would add podiatrists to the list of health care practitioners who are allowed to provide volunteer services at sponsored health care events. AB 2699 passed the Senate Business, Professions and Economic Development Committee by a vote of 5 to 1 on June 28, 2010. This measure now proceeds to the Senate Appropriations Committee.

**County-sponsored SB 878 (Liu)**, which as amended on June 10, 2010, would enhance the County's existing homeowner notification program, passed the Senate Floor by a vote of 28 to 5 on June 28, 2010. This measure now proceeds to the Governor.

*"To Enrich Lives Through Effective And Caring Service"*

***Please Conserve Paper – This Document and Copies are Two-Sided  
Intra-County Correspondence Sent Electronically Only***

**County-sponsored SB 994 (Price)**, which as introduced on February 9, 2010, would require the State to reimburse counties for elections to fill State and Federal legislative vacancies was held in the Senate Appropriations Committee on May 27, 2010. However, the Sacramento advocates were able to secure another legislative vehicle, AB 496 (Davis), which now contains the County-sponsored legislation previously included in SB 994.

AB 496, as amended on June, 22, 2010, would require that all expenses incurred in the preparation for and conduct of elections called by the Governor to fill a vacancy in the office of State Senator, Member of the Assembly, United States Senator or Representative in Congress be paid by the State. Further, when an election proclaimed by the Governor is consolidated with a local election, the State would be required to pay only those additional expenses directly related to the election proclaimed by the Governor. Therefore, consistent with the Board motion adopted on May 26, 2009 to pursue legislation to secure full reimbursement of costs associated with conducting special vacancy elections, **the Sacramento advocates will support AB 496**. This measure is currently in the Senate Rules Committee, awaiting referral to a policy committee.

#### **Status of County-Advocacy Legislation**

**County-supported AB 1717 (De Leon)**, which as amended on June 10, 2010, would: 1) authorize county and city election officials to offer registered voters the choice to opt out of receiving ballot materials by mail and choose to receive the materials via electronic mail or by accessing a website; 2) specify that voter's electronic mail addresses or any other information provided by the voter shall remain confidential; and 3) establish a procedure to allow voters to opt back into receiving materials by mail, passed the Assembly Floor by a vote of 76 to 0 on June 28, 2010. This measure now proceeds to the Governor.

**County-opposed unless amended AB 2499 (Portantino)**, which would revise the administration and licensing by the Department of Motor of Vehicles (DMV) of traffic violator schools and would eliminate the Traffic Violator School Monitoring Program by precluding the Los Angeles Superior Court from contracting with a court assistance program for monitoring services, was amended on June 22, 2010.

The June 22, 2010 amendments would: 1) cite legislative intent to utilize multiple third-party contractors or a Traffic Assistance Program (TAP) to conduct local monitoring of the traffic violator school program; 2) no longer authorize a court to contract with a Court Assistance Program (CAP) to perform services related to the processing and monitoring of traffic violator schools and instead authorize a TAP to contract with a court or the

DMV to assist in oversight activities; 3) define the services performed by a TAP to mean the processing of traffic infraction cases; and 4) require a court or TAP to provide only a DMV list of licensed traffic violator schools to consumers.

The Community Development Commission (CDC) indicates the bill would still eliminate the Traffic Violator School Monitoring (TVSM) Program in the County. Additionally, AB 2499 would not require the DMV to conduct local traffic violator school monitoring or to maintain the same level of traffic violator school monitoring currently conducted by CAPs. The bill also eliminates the TVSM Fraud Prevention Program conducted by the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department in cooperation with TVSM Program and would eliminate the court-managed list of traffic violator schools. Although the bill cites legislative intent for the DMV to contract with third-party monitors, the DMV would not be obligated to utilize third-parties contractors to conduct traffic violator school monitoring.

According to the CDC, in order for a TAP to continue providing monitoring services under AB 2499, it would have to enter into an agreement with the DMV on or before January 1, 2011; however, the bill does not provide for a time period for the DMV to establish contracts with TAPs before that date. The DMV has acknowledged that it currently does not have the ability or resources to conduct the regulation and monitoring of home study traffic schools and classroom traffic violator schools. Therefore, the elimination of the TVSM Program monitoring would bring to an end the high standard of routine monitoring of traffic violator schools in the County.

The Community Development Commission and this office recommend the County continue to oppose AB 2499 unless amended to:

- Allow a court to: 1) continue existing partnerships with third-party monitoring agencies for local-level traffic violator school monitoring; 2) provide consumers with a local listing of traffic violator schools printed and managed by a third-party agency conducting monitoring services on behalf of a court and/or the DMV; and 3) charge a traffic violator fee to provide continuous appropriation for monitoring services through the DMV and/or a third-party monitoring agency in the court's jurisdiction where the fee is collected; and
- Require the DMV to: 1) conduct routine traffic violator school monitoring services, including auditing, inspection, consumer complaint investigation and fraud investigation for all traffic violator schools; 2) contract with a court for local-level routine monitoring services and allow courts to contract with a third-party monitoring agency to provide these services; and 3) provide third-party monitoring agencies read-only access to the proposed DMV Internet

database list of licensed traffic violator schools to allow monitoring of enrollment and certificate of completion.

**County-opposed AB 2531 (Fuentes)**, which would expand the term redevelopment to include: 1) activities that result in the provision of employment opportunities; 2) the provision of direct assistance to businesses in connection with new or existing facilities within redevelopment project areas for industrial or manufacturing uses, including loans and other financial assistance, and/or the replacement of machinery and equipment in those facilities; and 3) job training, job placement, apprenticeship and pre-apprenticeship programs, and services relating to construction or operations of businesses in project areas, was amended on June 23, 2010.

The amendments would: 1) clarify that the Legislature finds and declares the need for the special law because of the unique circumstances pertaining to the Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Los Angeles; 2) change the sunset date for the provisions added by this measure from January 1, 2016 to January 1, 2018; and 3) specify that the provision of direct assistance to businesses may include, but is not limited to loans, loan guarantees and other financial assistance where the assistance is reasonably expected to either result in the retention or expansion of the number of persons employed in industrial manufacturing jobs or achieve certain environmental objectives.

According to County Counsel, the bill would still redefine redevelopment to include those activities that result in the provision of employment opportunities and would expand the fundamental purpose of redevelopment. The recent amendments also would: 1) extend the sunset date for the expansion of the definition and the scope of redevelopment activities; 2) give more authority to a redevelopment agency by specifying that direct assistance includes, but is not limited to, loans, loan guarantees and other financial assistance; and 3) allow a redevelopment agency to provide direct assistance where it is reasonably expected to result in either employment opportunities or achieve certain environmental objectives. County Counsel indicates that direct assistance for green sector improvements and efficiencies is a worthy goal; however, it is inconsistent with the existing purpose of Community Redevelopment law. AB 2531 would circumvent the direct link between blight and redevelopment. The definition of redevelopment has been carefully written to guarantee that agencies use redevelopment funds solely to cure existing blight. The use of diverted property tax increment funds for activities other than curing blight would negatively impact the County and other local taxing entities.

Each Supervisor  
June 30, 2010  
Page 5

County Counsel and this office recommend that the County continue to oppose AB 2531. This measure is scheduled for a hearing today in the Senate Local Government Committee.

**County-supported AB 2555 (Feuer)**, which would appropriate \$1.6 million from the State Health Facilities Citation Penalties Account to support long-term care ombudsman programs administered by the California Department of Aging, was heard before the Senate Appropriations Committee on June 28, 2010, and it was placed on the suspense file.

We will continue to keep you advised.

WTF:RA  
MR:RM:LY:sb

c: All Department Heads  
Legislative Strategist  
Local 721  
Coalition of County Unions  
California Contract Cities Association  
Independent Cities Association  
League of California Cities  
City Managers Associations  
Buddy Program Participants